

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

**Held electronically pursuant to a Continuity of Government  
Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2020.**  
**The meeting will be accessible on public access cable channel TV48 or  
the County's YouTube channel**

**(youtube.com/user/jamescitycounty).Citizen comments may be  
submitted via US Mail to the Planning Commission Secretary, PO  
Box 8784, Williamsburg, VA 23187, via electronic mail to  
community.development@jamescitycountyva.gov, or by leaving a  
message at 757-253-6750. Comments must be submitted no later than  
noon on the day of the meeting. Please provide your name and  
address for the public record.**

**July 13, 2020  
4:00 P.M.**

---

**I. ESTABLISHMENT OF CALL AND RESOLUTION OF TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES**

Mr. Rich Krapf called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

**II. CALL TO ORDER**

Present:

Jack Haldeman  
Rich Krapf  
Julia Leverenz  
Barbara Null  
Tim O'Connor  
Frank Polster  
Rob Rose  
Ginny Wertman

Staff:

Paul Holt, Director of Community Development  
Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development  
Ellen Cook, Principal Planner  
Tom Leininger, Senior Planner

Other:

Vlad Gavrilovic, EPR  
Todd Gordon, EPR  
Leigh Anne King, Clarion Associates  
Julie Herlands, TischlerBise  
Bill Thomas, Michael Baker International

**III. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION FOR PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP  
ELECTRONIC MEETING**

Ms. Julia Leverenz made a motion to Adopt the resolution.

The motion passed 8-0.

#### **IV. SCENARIO MODELING AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS SUMMARY**

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that scenario modeling was identified as a goal for the comprehensive plan update by Planning staff, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. She summarized the meetings and public input events that have contributed to the scenario planning process.

Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic stated that the land use model, travel demand model, and fiscal impact model generate performance indicators. He stated that the results of the scenarios would be presented at public meetings and used to refine goals and policies. He stated that there were two scenarios. He stated that the first scenario was a continuation of present trends and development patterns. He stated that the second scenario was guided by public input and included greater protections of rural lands and focusing growth inside the Primary Service Area (PSA). He presented maps showing growth patterns for both scenarios.

Ms. Julie Herlands presented information related to the fiscal impact model. She stated that the model would be used for comparisons between the scenarios. She stated that four Fiscal Analysis Zones (FAZ) would be used in the model. She stated that three of the zones were areas inside the PSA and the fourth zone was areas outside of the PSA. She stated that the fiscal impact model used control totals, which included the number of housing units and nonresidential square feet, property values, and student generation rates. She presented the results of both scenarios. She stated that the current trends scenario generated higher revenues and costs. She stated that the alternate scenario projected fewer students and lower school costs.

Mr. Frank Polster asked what the relationship is between the FAZ's and the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization's (HRTPO) Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) socioeconomic data. He asked how many additional schools, fire stations, and full-time emergency service employees would be needed for each scenario.

Ms. Herlands stated that control totals from the TAZ data were mapped to the FAZ's. She stated that she would provide additional information regarding schools and emergency services to the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG).

Mr. Jack Haldeman stated that both scenarios used control totals for population growth. He asked if it would be possible for both development patterns to result in the same total population in the real world.

Ms. Herlands stated that the fiscal impact model does not include a market analysis so the results do not suggest how quickly different land uses may be developed.

Ms. Ginny Wertman asked what the basis is for changing the boundary of the PSA at the north end of the County. She asked why the scenarios showed additional retail space when there is a desire for higher paying professional jobs.

Ms. Leverenz asked why the scenarios showed less industrial space. She stated that industrial businesses would add to the tax base and require fewer services than residential areas.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that Planning staff would provide additional information regarding the change to the PSA.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the scenarios included a smaller increase in employment for retail businesses. He stated that retail businesses typically have more floor area per employee.

Mr. Bill Thomas presented information related to the travel demand model. He stated that the

alternate scenario resulted in lower CO2 auto emissions and less roadway improvements required to maintain the level of service of roadways. He stated that the alternate scenario had a slightly better level of service for each roadway type when compared to the current trends scenario. He stated that the alternate scenario had a higher average speed for roadways serving the transit network. He stated that the alternate scenario had less travel delay from congestion due to there being less vehicle trips when compared to the current trends scenario. He presented maps showing roadway bottlenecks for both scenarios.

Ms. Wertman asked if trips originating from the City of Williamsburg or York County were excluded from the data.

Mr. Thomas stated that the model looks at how well the transportation system is working for transportation internal to the County.

Mr. Krapf stated that a number of housing developments have been proposed in upper York County which would result in more vehicle travel in the County. He asked if there was a way it could be accounted for in the travel demand model.

Mr. Thomas stated that travel from York County would be considered from the HRTPO's 2045 forecast and not necessarily from specific developments.

Mr. Rob Rose asked if the travel demand model could account for how the development patterns in the scenarios affect different types of transportation.

Mr. Thomas stated that the HRTPO data accounts for different types of transportation.

Mr. Rose stated that one of the goals was for the County to be more bike-friendly and walkable. He stated that it would be important to know if one of the scenarios supported that goal.

Mr. Thomas stated that the reduction in the number of vehicular trips in the alternate scenario is partly because the scenario has more compact growth.

Mr. Polster stated that it is important to consider the commuter traffic from outside of the County. Mr. Polster stated that the alternate scenario shows development at the Eastern State Hospital which did not seem to have an impact on Longhill Road in the map showing roadway bottlenecks.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that external traffic was counted in the model but the metrics focus on internal traffic.

Mr. Polster stated that the HRTPO completed a study for traffic in the Historic Triangle.

Mr. Holt stated that the HRTPO study looked at peak hour traffic while the traffic demand model looked at daily volume.

Mr. Thomas stated that they would be adding some data related to peak hour traffic.

Mr. Gavrilovic presented information related to the land use model. He stated that the alternate scenario had less total acreage of developed land. He stated that the alternate scenario generally had less acres of impervious surface in each watershed when compared to the current trends scenario. He stated that the alternate scenario had high population densities. He stated that the alternate scenario promoted infill housing and affordable housing types. He stated that the alternate scenario had a higher density of jobs. He stated that the alternate scenario had more dwellings close to forms of public transit. He stated that the alternate scenario seemed to be more in line with the public comments received so far but that the current trends scenario

would have a larger amount of net income.

Mr. Tim O'Connor left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Haldeman asked how they determined where future schools would be located. He asked why the walking distance to schools was the same for both scenarios if most schools are located in the PSA.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the fiscal impact model suggested what areas of the County would need new schools but not specific locations. He stated that concentrating growth in parts of the County may make certain schools have great walkability while other schools would be limited.

Ms. Wertman asked if all the multifamily and single-family attached units are considered affordable housing in the model. She asked if the student generation results of the models accounted for the different family compositions that would occur from having more multifamily developments.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the different place types used in the model included different household sizes. He stated that the model does not consider what units will be affordable but that multifamily units would provide opportunities for affordable housing.

Ms. Wertman asked why the multifamily housing property values were the same for all of the zones.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that an answer would be forwarded to the PCWG.

Mr. Polster stated that the Citizen Survey identifies five areas where there was a significant gap between the percentages of people who found the area important and the percentages of people who were satisfied with how the County is addressing those areas. He asked how the Planning staff and the consultant team would explain the ways the alternate scenario addresses those gaps at the next public assembly.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that they could provide a summary of the findings of each scenario and how they relate to the public input.

Mr. Polster stated that it would be important to relate the results of the models to the public input.

Mr. Krapf stated that it would be helpful if it was included with the next public assembly.

## **V. METROQUEST SURVEY AND GOALS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Mr. Gavrilovic presented the draft MetroQuest survey.

Mr. Rose stated that it is important to make sure the survey is easy to read. He stated that the legends on the scenario maps should be explained.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that they could add additional text on the maps.

Mr. Polster stated that it was important to ensure that the goals from the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan were being appropriately assessed. He stated that some people may want to rewrite goals without understanding the context of those goals from previous comprehensive plans.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the goals questionnaire and the results of the scenario modeling

would be used to refine the goals in the future.

Ms. Wertman stated that one of the descriptions on the MetroQuest survey did not match the subject. She stated that she had concerns with the legibility of charts on the survey.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that they would review the survey to make sure it was intuitive.

Ms. Barbara Null left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Krapf asked if staff and the consultants needed any action related to the survey.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that they are looking to get affirmation from the PCWG for the survey.

Mr. Jack Haldeman made a motion to give affirmation to the draft MetroQuest survey.

The motion passed 6-0.

## **VI. OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Mr. Krapf asked if there were any other items for discussion.

There were none.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Rose made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Krapf adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m.